

Mr. Jeff DeRouen Executive Director Kentucky Public Service Commission 211 Sower Boulevard Frankfort, KY 40602

RECEIVED

OCT 07 2011

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Louisville Gas and Electric Company

State Regulation and Rates 220 West Main Street PO Box 32010 Louisville, Kentucky 40232 www.lge-ku.com

Robert M. Conroy Director - Rates T 502-627-3324 F 502-627-3213 robert.conroy@lge-ku.com

October 7, 2011

RE: AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR THE TWO-YEAR BILLING PERIOD ENDING APRIL 30, 2011 CASE NO. 2011-00232

Dear Mr. DeRouen:

Please find enclosed and accept for filing the original and ten (10) copies of the Revised Direct Testimony of Robert M. Conroy and the Response of Louisville Gas and Electric Company to the Commission Staff's Questions Raised at the Informal Conference Request held on September 28, 2011, in the above-referenced matter.

Should you have any questions concerning the enclosed, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Conroy

Enclosures

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

| AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE |) | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------|
| COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL |) | |
| SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF LOUISVILLE GAS |) | CASE NO. |
| AND ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR THE TWO-YEAR |) | 2011-00232 |
| BILLING PERIOD ENDING APRIL 30, 2011 |) | |

REVISED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

ROBERT M. CONROY
DIRECTOR - RATES
LG&E AND KU SERVICES COMPANY

Filed: October 7, 2011

1 Q. Please state your name, title, and business address.

- 2 A. My name is Robert M. Conroy. I am the Director Rates for LG&E and KU
- 3 Services Company, which provides services to Louisville Gas and Electric Company
- 4 ("LG&E") and Kentucky Utilities Company ("KU") (collectively "the Companies").
- 5 My business address is 220 West Main Street, Louisville, Kentucky, 40202. A
- 6 complete statement of my education and work experience is attached to this testimony
- 7 as Appendix A.

12

19

8 Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?

- 9 A. Yes. I have previously testified before this Commission in proceedings concerning
- the Companies' most recent rate cases, fuel adjustment clauses, and environmental
- 11 cost recovery ("ECR") surcharge mechanisms.

Q. What is the purpose of this proceeding?

- 13 A. The purpose of this proceeding is to review the past operation of LG&E's
- environmental surcharge during the six-month billing period ending April 30, 2011
- that is part of the two-year billing period also ending April 30, 2011, determine
- whether the surcharge amounts collected during the period are just and reasonable,
- and then incorporate or "roll-in" such surcharge amounts into LG&E's existing
- electric base rates.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

- 20 A. The purpose of my testimony is to summarize the operation of LG&E's
- 21 environmental surcharge during the billing period under review, demonstrate that the
- amounts collected during the period were just and reasonable, present and discuss
- 23 LG&E's proposed adjustment to the Environmental Surcharge Revenue Requirement

based on the operation of the surcharge during the period and explain how the environmental surcharge factors were calculated during the period under review. Further, my testimony will recommend that the cumulative ECR revenue requirement for the twelve-months ending with the expense month of February 2011 be used for purposes of incorporating or "rolling-into" LG&E's electric base rates the appropriate surcharge amounts using the methodology previously approved by the Commission, most recently in Case No. 2009-00311.

A.

A.

Q. Please summarize the operation of the environmental surcharge for the billing period included in this review.

through April 30, 2011. For purposes of the Commission's examination in this case, the monthly LG&E environmental surcharges are considered as of the six-month billing period ending April 30, 2011; that same review period is part of the two-year billing period also ending April 30, 2011. (The three previous billing periods were reviewed in Cases No. 2009-00502, 2010-00242, and 2010-00475.) In each month of the six-month period under review in this proceeding, LG&E calculated the environmental surcharge factors in accordance with its tariff ES, and the requirements of the Commission's previous orders concerning LG&E's environmental surcharge.

Q. What costs were included in the calculation of the environmental surcharge factors for the billing period under review?

The capital and operating costs included in the calculation of the environmental surcharge factors for the billing period under review were the costs incurred each month by LG&E from September 2010 through February 2011, as detailed in the

attachment in response to Question No. 2 of the Commission Staff's Request for Information, incorporating all required revisions.

Q.

A.

The monthly environmental surcharge factors applied during the billing period under review were calculated consistent with the Commission's orders in LG&E's previous applications to assess or amend its environmental surcharge mechanism and plan, as well as orders issued in previous review cases. The monthly environmental surcharge reports filed with the Commission during this time reflect the various changes to the reporting forms ordered by the Commission from time to time.

Has the Commission recently approved changes to the environmental surcharge mechanism and the monthly ES Forms?

Yes. In Case No. 2009-00311, LG&E's most recent ECR two-year review, the Commission approved changes to the environmental surcharge mechanism that include the calculation of the monthly billing factor using a revenue requirement method instead of a percentage method (eliminating the use of the Base Environmental Surcharge Factor ("BESF")), the elimination of the monthly true-up adjustment, and revisions to the monthly reporting forms to reflect the approved changes. Pursuant to the Commission's December 2, 2009 Order in that case, the changes were implemented with the December 2009 expense month that was billed in February 2010. The approved changes only impact the timing and accuracy of the revenue collection, not the total revenues LG&E is allowed to collect through the ECR.

Q. Are there any changes or adjustments in Rate Base from the originally filed expense months?

- A. No. During the period under review, there were no changes to Rate Base from the originally filed billing period as summarized in LG&E's response to the Commission Staff's Request for Information, Question No. 1. In addition, there were no changes identified as a result of preparing responses to the requests for information in this review.
- 6 Q. Are there any changes necessary to the jurisdictional revenue requirement 7 (E(m))?
- A. Yes. Adjustments to E(m) are necessary for compliance with the Commission's

 Order in Case No. 2000-00386, to reflect the actual changes in the overall rate of

 return on capitalization that is used in the determination of the return on

 environmental rate base. The details of and support for this calculation are shown in

 LG&E's response to Question No. 1 of the Commission Staff's Request for

 Information.
- 14 Q. As a result of the operation of the environmental surcharge during the billing 15 period under review, is an adjustment to the revenue requirement necessary?
- 16 A. Yes. LG&E experienced a cumulative under-recovery of \$241,530 for the billing
 17 period ending April 30, 2011. LG&E's response to Question No. 2 of the
 18 Commission Staff's Request for Information shows the calculation of the cumulative
 19 under-recovery. An adjustment to the revenue requirement is necessary to reconcile
 20 the collection of past surcharge revenues with actual costs for the billing period under
 21 review.
- Q. Has LG&E identified the causes of the net under-recovery during the billing period under review?

A. Yes. LG&E has identified the components that make up the net under-recovery during the billing period under review. The components are (1) changes in overall rate of return as previously discussed, and (2) the use of 12 month average revenues to determine the billing factor. The details and support of the components that make up the net under-recovery during the billing period under review are shown in LG&E's response to Question No. 2 of the Commission Staff's Request for Information.

A.

Q. Please explain how the function of the ECR mechanism contributes to the net under-recovery in the billing period under review?

The use of 12-month average revenues to calculate the monthly billing factor and then applying that same billing factor to the actual monthly revenues will result in an over or under-collection of ECR revenues. Typically it will result in an over-collection during the summer months when actual revenues will generally be greater than the 12-month average and an under-collection during the balance of the year when actual revenues will generally be less than or near the 12-month average. The use of 12-month average revenues contributed to the net under-recovery as shown in LG&E's response to Question No. 2 of the Commission Staff's Request for Information.

During the period under review, LG&E's actual revenues were less than the 12-month historical average, with the exception of January 2011, during which time the weather was more severe than typical. The table below shows a comparison of the 12-month average revenues used in the monthly filings to determine the ECR

billing factor and the actual revenues which the ECR billing factor was applied in the billing month.

| Expense Month | 12-Month Average Revenue | Billing Month | Actual Revenues Subject to ECR Billing Factor |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---|
| September 2010 | \$ 68,965,871 | November 2010 | \$ 60,573,401 |
| October 2010 | 69,734,062 | December 2010 | 68,434,739 |
| November 2010 | 70,602,931 | January 2011 | 81,025,935 |
| December 2010 | 71,544,113 | February 2011 | 67,158,649 |
| January 2011 | 72,673,888 | March 2011 | 66,935,786 |
| February 2011 | 72,968,060 | April 2011 | 62,399,735 |

Q. What kind of adjustment is LG&E proposing in this case as a result of the operation of the environmental surcharge during the billing period?

A. LG&E is proposing that the net under-recovery be collected in one month following the Commission's Order in this proceeding. Specifically, LG&E recommends that the Commission approve an increase to the Environmental Surcharge Revenue Requirement of \$241,530 for one month, in the second full billing month following the Commission's Order in this proceeding. This method is consistent with the method of implementing previous over- or under-recovery positions in prior ECR review cases.

13 Q. What is the bill impact on a residential customer for the proposed collection of 14 the under-recovery?

A. The inclusion of the increase in the determination of the ECR billing factor will increase the billing factor by approximately 0.32%. For a residential customer using 1,000 kWh the impact of the adjusted ECR billing factor would be an increase of

- approximately \$0.25 for one month (using rates and adjustment clause factors in effect for the August 2011 billing month).
- Q. Should the Commission approve the incorporation into LG&E's base electric rates the environmental surcharge amounts found just and reasonable for the two year billing period ending April 2011?
- Yes. It is appropriate, at this time, to incorporate surcharge amounts found just and A. 6 7 reasonable for the two year billing period ending April 2011 into electric base rates. LG&E recommends that an incremental environmental surcharge amount of 8 9 \$2,330,762 be incorporated into base rates at the conclusion of this case. LG&E determined the incremental roll-in amount of \$2,330,762 using environmental 10 surcharge rate base as of February 28, 2011 and environmental surcharge operating 11 expenses for the twelve month period ending February 28, 2011. If approved, the 12 13 total amount of environmental surcharge that will be included in base rates will be \$9,850,653. The amount of environmental surcharge that will be included in base 14 15 rates represents rate base and operating expenses associated only with LG&E's 2005, 2006, and 2009 amendments to its Compliance Plan. All costs associated with the 16 2001 and 2003 amendments to the Compliance Plan were removed from ECR 17 18 recovery and included in base rates, consistent with the Commission's approval of the Stipulation and Recommendation in Case No. 2009-00549. 19
- Q. If the Commission accepts LG&E's recommendation to incorporate the proposed amount into base rates, what will be the impact on LG&E's ECR revenue requirement?

- 1 A. The incorporation of the recommended surcharge amount into base rates will increase
 2 base rates and, two months later, decrease ECR revenues by an equal amount. There
 3 will be no impact on the environmental costs LG&E is allowed to recover from its
 4 customers; only the method of collection will be impacted.
- O. Please explain why ECR revenues will not decrease in the same month that base rates will increase.
- A. The ECR is billed on a two-month lag, meaning that costs are incurred, for example, 7 in February 2011 (expense month) and ECR revenues are collected two months later 8 in April 2011 (billing month). LG&E's determination of costs recoverable through 9 the billing factor (E(m) for the expense month) are reduced by the ECR revenue 10 included in base rates. Therefore, total ECR costs for the month of February are 11 collected from customers through base rates in February and through the ECR billing 12 mechanism in April. If base rates increase due to a roll-in in February, the portion of 13 ECR costs incurred in February that is recovered through base rates will increase and 14 15 the resulting decrease in the ECR billing factor will be applied in April. If the decrease in the ECR billing factor were applied in February, the same month that base 16 rates change, then LG&E would not be collecting the correct amount of ECR revenue 17 associated with costs incurred in December. This is because the February billing 18 factor is associated with the December expense month and must be calculated using 19 base rates in effect in December. 20
- Q. Is LG&E proposing any changes to the monthly reporting forms used for calculating the environmental surcharge?

- LG&E currently has pending before the Commission its application for approval of 1 A. the 2011 amendments to its Compliance Plan (Case No. 2011-00162). In that case, 2 LG&E proposed certain modifications to the monthly filing forms. Certain of those 3 modifications can be implemented upon the issuance of the Commission's Order in 4 this case, should such an Order be issued prior to the issuance of an Order in Case 5 No. 2011-00162. Specifically, the modifications that LG&E could implement related 6 only to this review case are the elimination of references to LG&E's 2001 and 2003 7 Amendments to its Compliance Plan, consistent with the Commission's Order in Case 8 9 No. 2009-00549, as currently included on ES Forms 2.10 and 2.50. Additionally, the references to the Mill Creek Ash Dredging deferred debit balance and the associated 10 amortization on ES Form 2.00 can be removed since the deferred debit balance was fully amortized as of April 2010. 12
- What rate of return is LG&E proposing to use for all ECR Plans upon the Q. 13 14 Commission's Order in this proceeding?
- LG&E is recommending an overall rate of return on capital of 10.82%, including the A. 15 currently approved 10.63% return on equity and adjusted capitalization, to be used to 16 calculate the environmental surcharge. This is based on capitalization as of February 17 28, 2011 and the Commission's Order of July 30, 2010 in Case No. 2009-00549. 18 Please see the response and attachment to Commission Staff's Request for 19 Information Question No. 6(c) following this testimony. 20
 - Q. What is your recommendation to the Commission in this case?

11

21

LG&E makes the following recommendations to the Commission in this case: 22 A.

- 1 a) The Commission should approve the proposed increase to the Environmental
 2 Surcharge Revenue Requirement of \$241,530 for one month in the second full
 3 billing month following the Commission's decision in this proceeding;
 - b) The Commission should determine environmental surcharge amount for the six-month billing period ending April 30, 2011 to be just and reasonable;
 - c) The Commission should approve the use of an overall rate of return on capital of 10.82% using a return on equity of 10.63% beginning in the second full billing month following the Commission's Order in this proceeding.
- The Commission should approve a "roll-in" of \$2,330,762 in incremental environmental costs into LG&E's base rates, for a total base rate ECR component of \$9,850,653, to be included in base rates following the methodology previously approved by the Commission and implemented by LG&E.

14 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

15 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

VERIFICATION

| COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY |) | SS |
|--------------------------|---|----|
| COUNTY OF JEFFERSON |) | |

The undersigned, Robert M. Conroy, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director - Rates for LG&E and KU Services Company, and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the foregoing testimony, and that the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.

Robert M. Conroy

Notary Public

(SEAL

My Commission Expires:

APPENDIX A

Robert M. Conroy

Director - Rates LG&E and KU Services Company 220 West Main Street Louisville, Kentucky 40202 (502) 627-3324

Education

Masters of Business Administration

Indiana University (Southeast campus), December 1998. GPA: 3.9.

Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering;

Rose Hulman Institute of Technology, May 1987. GPA: 3.3

Essentials of Leadership, London Business School, 2004.

Center for Creative Leadership, Foundations in Leadership program, 1998.

Registered Professional Engineer in Kentucky, 1995.

Previous Positions

| Manager, Rates | April 2004 – Feb. 2008 |
|---|------------------------|
| Manager, Generation Systems Planning | Feb. 2001 – April 2004 |
| Group Leader, Generation Systems Planning | Feb. 2000 – Feb. 2001 |
| Lead Planning Engineer | Oct. 1999 – Feb. 2000 |
| Consulting System Planning Analyst | April 1996 – Oct. 1999 |
| System Planning Analyst III & IV | Oct. 1992 - April 1996 |
| System Planning Analyst II | Jan. 1991 - Oct. 1992 |
| Electrical Engineer II | Jun. 1990 - Jan. 1991 |
| Electrical Engineer I | Jun. 1987 - Jun. 1990 |

Professional/Trade Memberships

Registered Professional Engineer in Kentucky, 1995.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

| AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE |) | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------|
| COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL |) | |
| SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF LOUISVILLE GAS |) | CASE NO. |
| AND ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR THE TWO-YEAR |) | 2011-00232 |
| BILLING PERIOD ENDING APRIL 30, 2011 |) | |

RESPONSE OF
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
TO
COMMISSION STAFF'S QUESTIONS RAISED AT
THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2011 INFORMAL CONFERENCE

FILED: October 7, 2011

VERIFICATION

| COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY | | SS |
|--------------------------|---|----|
| COUNTY OF JEFFERSON | ĺ | |

The undersigned, **Robert M. Conroy**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director - Rates for LG&E and KU Services Company, and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which he is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.

Robert M. Conroy

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this 44 day of 2011.

Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

July 21, 2015

VERIFICATION

| COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY |) | SS |
|--------------------------|---|----|
| COUNTY OF JEFFERSON |) | |

The undersigned, **Shannon L. Charnas**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is Director – Accounting and Regulatory Reporting for LG&E and KU Services Company, and that she has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which she is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of her information, knowledge and belief.

Shannon L. Charnas

Notary Public (SEAL)

My Commission Expires:

Response to Commission Staff's Questions Raised at the September 28, 2011 Informal Conference

Case No. 2011-00232

Question No. 1

Witness: Robert M. Conroy

- Q-1. In the Direct Testimony of Robert M. Conroy, there are references to both an over-recovery position and under-recovery position for the 6-month review period. Please clarify the correct recovery position through revised testimony.
- A-1. Please see Mr. Conroy's revised testimony submitted with the responses to this data request.

Response to Commission Staff's Questions Raised at the September 28, 2011 Informal Conference

Case No. 2011-00232

Question No. 2

Witness: Robert M. Conroy / Shannon L. Charnas

- Q-2. Refer to page 3 of 3 in the Attachment to LG&E's response to Question No. 1. Please explain the basis for the following:
 - a. The Electric Rate Base Percentage contained in column 3 (78.940%).
 - b. Environmental Surcharge (Net of ECR Roll-in) contained in Column 15 (\$14,337,284).
- A-2. a. The Electric Rate Base Percentage is an allocation of LG&E's investments between its electric and gas businesses. The allocation is determined annually through an allocation of LG&E's revenues, expenses, and investments to electric, gas and common lines of business, with common costs further allocated to gas and electric. LG&E's annual electric -- gas cost separation is the basis for the financial statements filed quarterly in compliance with various merger commitments.

See the attachment to this response for documentation of the electric rate base percentage (78.94%) at December 31, 2010.

b. The Environmental Surcharge (Net of ECR Roll-in) is determined by subtracting the ECR rate base rolled-in to base rates from the total ECR rate base at April 30, 2011. See below:

| | E | lectric Only |
|---|----|--------------|
| ECR Rate Base at April 30, 2011 less ECR Rate Base Rolled-in to Base | \$ | 72,896,086 |
| Rates | \$ | 58,558,802 |
| ECR Adjustment to Capitalization | \$ | 14,337,284 |

ECR Rate Base at April 30, 2011 is from ES Form 1.10, line (1) RB, filed with the Commission on May 20, 2011. ECR rate base rolled-in to base rates is provided in the attachment to Question No. 4(c).

INCLUDING ECR RATE BASE - (PLANT, DEPRECIATION, DEFERRED TAXES)

LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY Net Cost Base

For 12 Months Ended December 31, 2010

| | • | • | |
|--|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| • | <u>Electric</u> | <u>Gas</u> | Combined |
| NET COST BASE - | | | |
| Utility Plant at Original Cost (1) | 3,962,347,346 | 786,492,308 | 4,748,839,654 |
| Less: Reserve for Depreciation (1) | 1,789,073,582 | 254,026,208 | 2,043,099,790 |
| Customer Advances for Construction (5) | 1,750,059 | 6,830,871 | 8 , 580 , 930 |
| Deferred Income Taxes (5) | 371,773,173 | 50,889,261 | 422,662,434 |
| Deferred Taxes - FAS 109 | 30,032,245 | 3,489,597 | 33,521,842 |
| Investment Tax Credit | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL UTILITY PLANT LESS DEPR. RESERVE, ETC. | 1,769,718,287 | 471,256,371 | 2,240,974,658 |
| Materials and Supplies (2)(4) | 96,144,968 | 58,527 | 96,203,495 |
| Gas Stored Underground (2) | 0 | 40,926,273 | 40,926,273 |
| Prepayments (2)(3) | 4,833,738 | 658,365 | 5,492,103 |
| Çash Working Capital | 80,650,982 | 7,732,822 | 88,383,804 |
| Mill Creek Ash Dredging-Regulatory Asset (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL NET COST BASE | 1,951,347,975 | 520,632,358 | 2,471,980,333 |
| | 78.94% | 21.06% | . 100.00% |
| | pl. | | |

Notes:

- (1) Common utility plant and reserve allocated 73% Electric; 27% Gas.
- (2) Average for 13 Months ended current month.
- (3) Excludes PSC Fees
- (4) Excludes 25% of Trimble County Inventories.
- (5) Common portion allocated on utility plant and reserve basis 73% Electric; 27% Gas
- (6) This line was added in March 2009 to be consistent with rate base calculation prepared by the Rates Dept. as well as rate base filed for the ECR mechanism.

Response to Commission Staff's Questions Raised at the September 28, 2011 Informal Conference

Case No. 2011-00232

Question No. 3

Witness: Robert M. Conroy

- Q-3 Refer to page 2 of 3 in the Attachment to LG&E's response to Question No. 2.
 - a. Please explain why the values in Column 7 for the expense months of September 09, October 09, and November 2009 do not equate to the calculation of Column 5 divided by Column 6 as indicated.
 - b. Please explain why -0.80% is listed in Column 10 for the As Filed Monthly Billing Factor for the September 2010 expense month when a revised filing was made on October 19, 2010 for the September 2010 expense month indicating that the billing factor is 0.01%. What factor was billed customers for the September 2011 expense month?
- A-3. a. The values in Column 7 of page 2 of 3 in the Attachment were originally presented to the Commission in Case No. 2010-00242 as the "As Filed" Current Environmental Surcharge Factor ("CESF"). The review case responses and attachments for the first six-month period in this two-year review originally presented the amounts in Column 7 as recalculated CESF, reflecting what the factors would have been using the revised rates of return. In preparing the current attachment, LG&E ensured that previously provided information remained unchanged in this attachment, but neglected to address the column heading that indicates that all amounts in Column 7 are the result of a calculation. Going forward, Columns 7, 8 and 9 will not be part of this attachment.
 - b. The ECR billing factor used for November 2011 billing was 0.01%. However, the total ECR Billing Factor Revenues for the November 2011 billing month is negative due to some customers being issued their October 2011 bills in November 2011. All November revenues were included in reported amounts, even if the amounts were related to previous billing periods. The negative revenue from the October 2011 ECR billing factor of (2.5%) was greater than the positive revenue from the November 2011 ECR billing factor of 0.01%. Please see the revised attachment for the correct presentation of the billing factor charged customers in November 2010 for the September 2010 expense month.

Louisville Gas & Electric Company Calculation of E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor Summary Schedule for Expense Months March 2009 through February 2011

| (E) | (2) | (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) | (†) | (5) | (9) | (7) | (8) | (6) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (51) |
|------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|---|------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|
| Expense | Retail E(m) | Adjustment to Retail E(m) for Under- Collection | Prior Period Adjustment (As Filed) | Retail E(m) Including all Adjustments | Average Monthly Retail Revenues | Current Environmental Surcharge Factor (CESF) | Basc Environmental Surcharge Factor (BESF) | Monthly Environmental Surcharge Factor (MESF) | Monthly Billing Factor | ECR Revenue Recovered Through Base Rates Revenue | Billing Perrod | ECR Revenue Recovered Through Base Rates | ECR Billing Factor Revenues | Combined Total Over/(Under) Recovery |
| | - 1 | Case Nos. 2009-00502; 2010-00241; 2010- 00475 | | (2) + | ES F | (9)/(9) | | (2) - (2) | As Filed | 2 4 | 98 34 | Sin Si | | (5) - (13) - (14) or (5) - (11) - (14) |
| | S 2,772,670 3,004,943 | s | S | \$ 2,772,670 3,004,943 | \$ 64,615,926 64,540,021 | 4.29% 4.66% | 3.62% 3.62% | 0.67% | | v. | May-09 Jun-09 | 2,152,606 | 1,535,289 | 682,952 |
| Mav-09 | 2,775,073 | • | | 2,775,073 | 64,808,676 | 4.28% | 3.62% | 0.66% | | | Jul-09 Aug-09 | 2,366,888 | 1,357,212 835,493 | 949,027 (186,863) |
| Jul-09 | 3,169,354 | 202,846 | | 3,372,200 | | 5.19% | 3.62% | 1.57% | | 1 | Scp-09 | 2,151,236 | 336,310 | (884,653) |
| Aug-09 | 3,266,691 | 202,846 | | 3,469,537 | 64,293,669 | 5.40% | 3.62% | 1.0% | | | 0-90 | \$ 12.653,860 | \$ 5.616,576 | \$ (390,130) |
| Scp-09 | \$ 3,274,715 | \$ 202,846 | S | \$ 3,477,561 | 85 | 5,16% | 3.62% | 1.54% | | | Nov-09 | \$ 1,646,138 | \$ 761,325 | S (1.070,098) |
| Oct-09 | 2,970,834 | | | 2,970,834 | 63,384,159 | 4.92% | 3.62% | 1.30% | | , 1 | Dec-09 Jan-10 | 1,869,544 | 749,427 | (351,863) |
| Dec-09 | 3,110,179 | 545,396 | | 3,655,575 | | | | | 2.86% | , | Feb-10 | • | 1,807,451 | (1,848,124) |
| Jan-10 Feh-10 | 3,020,082 | 545,396 | | 3,565,478 | 63,063,357 | | | | -0.31% | 2,640,477 | Apr-10 | | | |
| parisel | | | | \$ 19,915,920 | | | | | | \$ 2,640,477 | | \$ 5,729,553 | \$ 5,831,128 | \$ (5.714.763) |
| | s | | S | \$ 3,169,571 | \$ 63,776,579 | | | | %06.0 %06.0 | \$ 2,590,497 | May-10 Jun-10 | · · | \$ 572,800 2,482,673 | S (6,274) 1,469,713 |
| Apr-10 Mav-10 | 3,323,686 | 390,130 | | 3,333,077 | | | | | 1.53% | 2,309,086 | Jul-10 | • | 1,519,099 | 495,109 |
| Jun-10 | | | | 3,260,341 | 64,794,282 | | | | -0.11% | 3,559,513 | Aug-10 Sep-10 | | (125,080) (520,026) | (281,150) (167,918) |
| Aug-10 | | | | 770,176 | | | | | -2.50% | | Oct-10 | | 1 | ľ |
|) | | | | \$ 17,064,256 | | | | | | S 16,281,290 | | - S | \$ 2,202,480 | \$ 1,419,514 |
| | S | | · · s | \$ 788,317 | s | | | | 0.01% | \$ 816,260 | Nov-10 | | \$ (28,034) | (16) S |
| Oct-10 | | • | | 689,378 | 69,734,062 | | | | 0.40% | 579,352 | Jan-11 | | 146,568 | 20,634 |
| Dcc-10 | | 795,605 | | 1,550,464 | | | | | 1.29% | 640,503 | Feb-11 | • | 819,108 | (90,853) |
| Jan-11 | | 795,605 | | 1,524,478 | 72,673,888 | | | | 1.09% | 746,338 | Mar-11 | r 1 | 742,383 | (35,757) |
| Feb-11 | 847,671 | C09'C6/ | | \$ 6,901,199 | | | | | | \$ 4,078,715 | | S | \$ 2,580,954 | \$ (241,530) |
| | - | | | CT6 1F5 C9 S | | | | | | \$ 23.000,482 | | \$ 18,383,412 | S 16,231,138 | \$ (4,926,909) |
| Less Amounts | Less Amounts from previous 6-month reviews: | nonth reviews: | 2009-00502 | | | | | | | 2,640,477 | | 12,653,860 5,729,553 | 5,616,576 5,831,128 | (390,130) (5,714,763) |
| | | | 2010-00475 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Total for the c | Total for the current 6-month period: | riod; | | \$ 6,901,199 | | | | | | \$ 4,078,715 | | ^ | teginger7 s | (141,530) |
| | | | | | Net Under-Recovery to be collected from customers for the 6-month billing period ending April 30, 2011: | y to be collected fra | om customers for th | ie 6-month billing p | eriod ending | April 30, 2011: | | | | s (241,530) |
| | | | | | | *************************************** | | | | | | | | |

Note 1: Beginning with the Dec09 expense month, LG&E transitioned to the Revenue Requirement methodology approved in Case No. 2009-40310

Revised Attachment to Response to Question No. 2
Attachment to Response to Informal Conference Question No. 3(b)
Page 1 of 1
Conroy

The ECR Revenue recovered through Base Rates in February 2010 and August 2010 was revised from the originally filed amount (see Prior Period Adjustments included in the April and September 2010 expense month filings). Note 2:

Response to Commission Staff's Questions Raised at the September 28, 2011 Informal Conference

Case No. 2011-00232

Question No. 4

Witness: Robert M. Conroy

- Q-4. Refer to the Attachment to LG&E's response to Question No. 5. Please provide the following:
 - a. Explain why the Amortization of Investment Tax Credit of \$(24,553) is not shown as a Pollution Control Operating Expense on page 1 of 2 when it is listed in Support Schedule A on page 2 of 2. Verify whether the amount of the ITC is included in the 3,029,989 value on Support Schedule A.
 - b. Explain why the calculation of the Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Requirement of \$9,872,084 is not equal to the Total Company Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Requirement of \$11,309,280 multiplied by the Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio of 87.2919%.
 - c. Supporting documentation for the Jurisdictional Environmental Revenue Previously Rolled In showing the amount from Case No. 2009-00311 and the effect of eliminating the 2001 and 2003 Plans.
- A-4. a. Please see the revised attachment to Question No. 5 including the amortization of the ITC in Pollution Control Operating Expense.
 - b. The difference is due to rounding. Please see the revised attachment that rounds the Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio and then calculates the Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Requirement. As a result of the rounded calculation and the correction referenced in part a, LG&E's incremental roll-in amount should be \$2,330,762. Mr. Conroy's revised testimony reflecting these changes is being submitted with responses to this data request in response to Question No. 1.
 - c. See attached.

Louisville Gas and Electric Company Calculation of ECR Roll-in at February 28, 2011

| Calculation of Revenue Requirement for Roll-In: | | Environmental Compliance Plans at Feb. 28, 2011 |
|--|--|--|
| Environmental Compliance Rate Base Pollution Control Plant in Service Pollution Control CWIP Excluding AFUDC | ES Form 2.00, February 2011 ES Form 2.00, February 2011 Subtotal | 65,553,070 11,127,475 76,680,545 |
| Additions: Mill Creek Deferred Debit Cash Working Capital Allowance | ES Form 2.00, February 2011 ES Form 2.00, February 2011 Subtotal | 246,693 246,693 |
| Deductions: Accumulated Depreciation on Pollution Control Plant Pollution Control Deferred Income Taxes | ES Form 2.00, February 2011 ES Form 2.00, February 2011 Subtotal | 2,425,274 2,136,919 4,562,193 |
| Environmental Compliance Rate Base | | \$ 72,365,045 |
| Rate of Return Environmental Compliance Rate Base | ES Form 1.10, February 2011 | 11.18% |
| Return on Environmental Compliance Rate Base | | \$ 8,090,412 |
| Pollution Control Operating Expenses 12 Month Depreciation and Amortization Expense 12 Month Amortization of Investment Tax Credit 12 Month Taxes Other than Income Taxes 12 Month Operating and Maintenance Expense 12 Month Ash Dredging Expense | See Support Schedule A See Support Schedule A See Support Schedule A See Support Schedule A See Support Schedule A | 953,730 (24,553) 102,718 1,630,599 342,942 |
| Total Pollution Control Operating Expenses | | \$ 3,005,436 |
| Gross Proceeds from By-Product & Allowance Sales | See Support Schedule B | (188,879) |
| Total Company Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue R | Requirement Roll In Amount | |
| Return on Environmental Compliance Rate Base Pollution Control Operating Expenses Less Gross Proceeds from By-Product & Allowance Sales | | 8,090,412 3,005,436 (188,879) |
| Roll In Amount | | \$ 11,284,727 |
| Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio Roll In | See Support Schedule C | 87.2919% |
| Jurisdictional Revenues for 12 Months for Roll In | See Support Schedule C | 875,616,715 |
| Roll In Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Factor: | | |
| Total Company Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Requ | uirement Roll In Amount | \$ 11,284,727 |
| Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio Roll In | | <u>87.2919%</u> |
| Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Require Less Jurisdictional Environmental Revenue Previously Rolle Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Require | ed In 1 | 9,850,653 7,519,891 \$ 2,330,762 |

¹ Amount Previously Rolled-in is the roll-in from Case 2009-00311 less the amounts associated with LG&E's 2001 and 2003 Plan which were eliminated from the ECR in LG&E's most recent base rate case.

Louisville Gas and Electric Company Calculation of ECR Roll-in at February 28, 2011

Support Schedule A

12 Month Balances for Selected Operating Expense Accounts ¹

at Feb. 28, 2011

| | Depreciation & | Taxes Other than | | | | Ash Dredging | Amortization of | |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|
| | Amortization | Income Taxes | Operating a | nd Maintenance | Expense | Expense | ITC | Total |
| | Steam Plant | | FERC 502 | FERC 506 | FERC 512 | | | |
| Mar-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 43,088 | 71,514 | 44 | 171,471 | | 355,150 |
| Apr-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 39,926 | 123,147 | 527 | 171,471 | | 404,105 |
| May-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 36,993 | 88,398 | 54 | - | | 194,478 |
| Jun-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 19,519 | 94,801 | 40,532 | • | | 223,885 |
| Jul-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 26,881 | 83,162 | 33,014 | | | 212,090 |
| Aug-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 10,904 | 97,616 | 2,175 | | | 179,728 |
| Sep-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 38,657 | 125,974 | 1,213 | - | | 234,877 |
| Oct-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 21,991 | 68,784 | 3,597 | - | | 163,405 |
| Nov-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 22,286 | 97,488 | 1,700 | * | | 190,507 |
| Dec-10 | 60,621 | 8,412 | 88,312 | 83,365 | 4,010 | - | | 244,720 |
| Jan-11 | 136,047 | 9,299 | 45,766 | 52,158 | 2,965 | - | (10,026) | 236,209 |
| Feb-11 | 211,473 | 9,299 | 67,781 | 76,379 | 15,878 | | (14,527) | 366,283 |
| less Base Rate | amount | | | | | - | | - |
| Total | ls <u>953,730</u> | 102,718 | 462,105 | 1,062,788 | 105,707 | 342,942 | (24,553) | 3,005,436 |

¹ All amounts included in Support Schedule A are exclusive of costs associated with LG&E's 2001 and 2003 Plans, which were eliminated from the ECR in August 2010

Support Schedule B

12 Month Balances for Allowance Sales and By-Product Sales

| | | Total Proceeds | | |
|--------|--------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | from Allowance | Proceeds from By- | Total All Sale |
| | | Sales | Product Sales | Proceeds |
| | | ES Form 2.00 | ES Form 2.00 | |
| Mar-10 | | - | - | - |
| Apr-10 | | (189,461) | - | (189,461) |
| May-10 | | - | - | - |
| Jun-10 | | - | • | - |
| Jul-10 | | 97 | 79 | 97 |
| Aug-10 | | 123 | - | 123 |
| Sep-10 | | 134 | - | 134 |
| Oct-10 | | - | - | - |
| Nov-10 | | • | - | - |
| Dec-10 | | 73 | - | 73 |
| Jan-11 | | 52 | - | 52 |
| Feb-11 | _ | 103 | - | 103 |
| | | | | |
| | Totals | (188,879) | _ | (188,879) |

Support Schedule C

12 Month Balances for Jurisdictional Revenues and Allocation Ratio

| | Rev E | KY Retail venues, Excl nvir. Surch Revenues | Ex | ntal Company Revenues, cluding Envir | KY Retail Allocation Ratio |
|--------|----------|--|-----|--|-------------------------------|
| | • | /evenues | Sui | Cit. Nevenues | KY Retail/ |
| | ES | S Form 3.00 | Е | S Form 3.00 | Total Company |
| Mar-10 | \$ | 62,521,754 | \$ | 70,324,266 | 88.9050% |
| Apr-10 | | 56,355,072 | | 66,970,466 | 84.1491% |
| May-10 | | 56,850,605 | | 66,603,435 | 85.3569% |
| Jun-10 | | 80,270,508 | | 85,821,547 | 93.5319% |
| Jul-10 | | 93,021,435 | | 100,787,352 | 92.2948% |
| Aug-10 | | 90,875,356 | | 98,180,078 | 92.5599% |
| Sep-10 | | 88,756,203 | | 97,873,168 | 90.6849% |
| Oct-10 | | 69,773,058 | | 81,598,945 | 85.5073% |
| Nov-10 | | 60,573,401 | | 72,566,237 | 83.4733% |
| Dec-10 | | 68,434,739 | | 81,996,030 | 83.4610% |
| | | 81,025,935 | | 99,329,497 | 81.5729% |
| Feb-11 | | 67,158,649 | | 81,039,631 | 82.8714% |
| | | | | | |

Totals \$ 875,616,715 \$ 1,003,090,652 87.2919%

Louisville Gas and Electric Company Calculation of ECR Roll-in at February 28, 2009 and Elimination of 2001 and 2003 Compliance Plans

| | | | TOTAL | | Eliminated Plans (2001 & 2003) | (2001 & 2003) | Post Rate Case ECR Plans (05 & 06) | Plans (05 & 06) |
|---|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Calculation of Revenue Requirement | | | Environmental Compliance Plans | Jurisdictional | Environmental Compliance Plans | Jurisdictional | Environmental Compliance Plans | Jurisdictional |
| Environmental Compliance Rate Base Pollution Control Plant in Service | | ES Form 2.00, February 2009 | 242,856,023 | 186,207,824 | 225,893,107 | 173,201,650 | 16,962,916 | 13,006,174 |
| Pollution Control CWIP Excluding AFUDC | Subtotal | ES Form 2.00, February 2009 | 40,997,828 283,853,851 | 31,434,742 217,642,566 | 225,893,107 | 173,201,650 | 40,997,828 57,960,744 | 31,434,742 44,440,915 |
| Additions: Mill Creek Deferred Debit Cash Working Capital Allowance | Scriptotal | ES Form 2.00, February 2009 ES Form 2.00, February 2009 | 2,400,596 773,476 3,174,072 | 1,840,637 593,055 | 388,521 | 297,895 | 2,400,596 384,954 2,785,550 | 1,840,637 295,160 2,135,797 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Deductions: Accumulated Depreciation on Pollution Control Plant Pollution Control Deferred Income Taxes Pollution Control Deferred Investment Tax Credit | | ES Form 2.00, February 2009 ES Form 2.00, February 2009 ES Form 2.00, February 2009 | 31,176,384 13,965,363 | 23,904,232 10,707,825 | 30,070,389 12,883,866 | 23,056,219 9,878,596 | 1,105,995 | 848,012 829,229 - |
| | Subtotal | | 45,141,747 | 34,612,057 | 42,954,255 | 32,934,816 | 2,187,492 | 1,677,241 |
| Environmental Compliance Rate Base | | | \$ 241,886,176 \$ | 185,464,201 | \$ 183,327,373 | \$ 140,564,730 | \$ 58,558,802 | \$ 44,899,471 |
| Rate of Return Environmental Compliance Rate Base | | ES Form 1.10, February 2009 | 10.98% | 10.98% | 10.98% | 10.98% | 10.98% | 10.98% |
| Return on Environmental Compliance Rate Base | | | \$ 26,559,102 \$ | 20,363,969 | \$ 20,129,346 | \$ 15,434,007 | \$ 6,429,756 | \$ 4,929,962 |
| Pollution Control Operating Expenses 12 Month Depreciation and Amortization Expense 12 Month Taxes Other than Income Taxes 12 Month Operating and Maintenance Expense 12 Month Ash Dredging Expense | | See Support Schedule A See Support Schedule A See Support Schedule A See Support Schedule A | 7,494,634 353,407 4,146,881 2,040,926 | 5,746,448 270,972 3,179,586 1,564,863 | 7,011,570 302,428 3,108,167 | 5,376,063 231,884 2,383,161 | 483,064 50,979 1,038,713 2,040,926 | 370,385 39,088 796,425 1,564,863 |
| Total Pollution Control Operating Expenses | | | \$ 14,035,848 | 10,761,869 | \$ 10,422,165 | \$ 7,991,108 | \$ 3,613,682 | \$ 2,770,761 |
| Gross Proceeds from By-Product & Allowance Sales | | See Support Schedule B | 235,844 | 180,831 | • | • | 235,844 | 180,831 |
| Total Company Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Requirement | quírement | | | | | | | |
| Return on Environmental Compliance Rate Base Pollution Control Operating Expenses Less Gross Proceeds from By-Product & Allowance Sales | | | 26,559,102 14,035,848 (235,844) | 20,363,969 10,761,869 (180,831) | 20,129,346 10,422,165 | 15,434,007 | 6,429,756 3,613,682 (235,844) | 4,929,962 2,770,761 (180,831) |
| Total Company Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Requirement | ment | | \$ 40,359,106 | 30,945,007 | \$ 30,551,511 | \$ 23,425,115 | \$ 9,807,595 | \$ 7,519,891 |
| Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio | | See Support Schedule C | 76.6742% | | 76.6742% | | 76.6742% | |
| Jurisdictional Revenues for 12 Months | | See Support Schedule C | \$ 778,413,572 | | \$ 778,413,572 | | \$ 778,413,572 | |
| Total Company Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Requirement | ment | | \$ 40,359,106 | | \$ 30,551,511 | | \$ 9,807,595 | |
| Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio | | | 76.6742% | | 76.6742% | | 76.6742% | |
| Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Gross Revenue Requirement | uirement | | \$ 30,944,994 | | \$ 23,425,115 | | \$ 7,519,891 | |

Response to Commission Staff's Questions Raised at the September 28, 2011 Informal Conference

Case No. 2011-00232

Question No. 5

Witness: Robert M. Conroy / Shannon L. Charnas

- Q-5. Refer to LG&E's response to Question No. 6. Provide a schedule showing LG&E's adjusted rate of return on common equity as of February 28, 2011 in the same format as the page 3 of 3 in the Attachment to LG&E's response to Question No. 1.
- A-5. See attached schedule, using the Electric Rate Base Percentage described in response to Question No. 2.

The Environmental Surcharge (Net of ECR Roll-in) is determined by subtracting the ECR rate base rolled-in to base rates from the total ECR rate base at February 28, 2011. See below:

| | \mathbf{E} | lectric Only |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| ECR Rate Base at Feb. 28, 2011 | \$ | 72,365,045 |
| less ECR Rate Base Rolled-in to | | |
| Base Rates | \$ | 58,558,802 |
| ECR Adjustment to Capitalization | \$ | 13,806,243 |

ECR Rate Base at February 28, 2011 is from ES Form 1.10, line (1) RB, filed with the Commission on March 18, 2011. ECR rate base rolled-in to base rates is provided in the attachment to Question No. 4(c).

Adjusted Electric Rate of Return on Common Equity As of February 28, 2011

| | | | | | Adjustments | Adjusted | | | Cost |
|-------------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|
| | | | | Electric | đ | Electric | Adjusted | Annual | jo |
| | Per Books | Capital | Rate Base | Capitalization | Capitalization | Capitalization | Capital | Cost | Capital |
| | 02-28-11 | Structure | | (Col 1 x Col 3) | (Col 17) | (Col 4 + Col 5) | Structure | Rate | (Col 8 x Col 7) |
| | \equiv | (2) | | (4) | (5) | (9) | (7) | (8) | (6) |
| ELECTRIC | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Short Term Debt | \$ 5,664,000 | 0.23% | 78.940% | \$ 4,471,162 | \$ 58,458 | \$ 4,529,620 | 0.23% | 0.25% | %00.0 |
| 2. Long Term Debt | 1,105,402,326 | 44.91% | 78.940% | 872,604,596 | 11,414,595 | 884,019,191 | 44.91% | 3.90% | 1.75% |
| 3. Common Equity | 1,350,462,845 | 54.86% | 78.940% | 1,066,055,370 | 13,943,546 | 1,079,998,916 | 54.86% | 10.63% | 5.83% |
| 4. Total Capitalization | \$ 2,461,529,171 | 100.000% | | \$ 1,943,131,128 | \$ 25,416,599 | \$ 1,968,547,727 | 100.000% | | 7.58% |

Weighted Cost of Capital Grossed up for Income Tax Effect {ROR + (ROR - DR) x [TR / (1 - TR)]}

10.82%

| Total Adjustments To Capital (17) | | 58,458 | 11,414,595 | 13,943,546 | 25,416,599 |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| A L | | 6 9 | | | S |
| Advanced Coal Investment Tax Credit (b) (Col 11 x Col 16 Line 4) (16) | | 54,441 | 10,630,189 | 12,985,353 | 23,669,983 |
| ı | | 69 | | | 89 |
| Environmental Surcharge (Net of ECR Roll-in) (Cal 11 x Cal 15 Inter 4) | | \$ (31,754) | (6,200,384) | (7,574,105) | \$ (13,806,243) |
| | | m | с | 5 | 0 |
| JDIC (Col 11 x Col 14 Line 4) (14) | | 47,703 | 9,314,433 | 11,378,085 | 20,740,220 |
| °S) | | S | | | ક્ક |
| Investments in OVEC & Other (Col II x Col II Line 4) (13) | | (1,394) | (272,229) | (332,542) | (606,165) |
| 1 | | S | ری | 4) | <u> </u> |
| Trim ble County Inventories (a) (cd 11 x Cd 12 Line 4) (12) | | (10,537) | (2,057,415) | (2,513,244) | (4,581,195) |
| T I û | | 69 | | | s» |
| Capital Structure (11) | | 0.23% | 44.91% | 54.86% | 100.000% |
| Capitalization (Col 4) | | \$ 4,471,162 | 872,604,596 | 1,066,055,370 | \$ 1,943,131,128 |
| 1 | | ± | | | uoi. |
| | <u> SLECTRIC</u> | Short Term Debt | 2. Long Term Debt | Common Equity | . Total Capitalization |
| | E | | 7 | m. | 4. |

 (a)
 Trimble County Inventories
 As of February 28, 2011

 Materials and Supplies
 \$ 5,236,513

 Stores Expense
 912,940

 Coal
 11,802,424

 Limestone
 177,659

 Fuel Oil
 194,800

 Emission Allowances
 \$ 18,324,782

 Multiplied by Disallowed Portion
 25,000%

 Trimble County Inv. Disallowed
 \$ 4,581,195

(b) Reflects Investment Tax Credit treatment per Case No. 2007-00179.